

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 93 14:09:14 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #226
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 13 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 226

Today's Topics:

 antenna restrictions
 Brilliant postings
 Comments on CW issue.
 Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
 Give a VE \$5.60, walk (Really, the semiannual CW war)
 Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams
 machine-generated cw (2 msgs)
 The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1993 10:37:10 GMT
From: saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!
hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hplb!hpwin052!hpqmoea!dstock@ames.arpa
Subject: antenna restrictions
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I've just received some E-mail, it seems my previous post could be
seen as flaming Derek's spelling. It was not written as a spelling
flame.

I so enjoyed Derek's peccadillo-as-an-animal piece, I added a Quayle
to the menagerie.

Derek and myself have almost parallel senses of humour, and we're

having a little fun. Everyone makes the occasional spelling error or hits a wrong key, but it takes a real star to do it on World TV and overrule a child who was right.

David GM4ZNX

Date: 13 Jul 93 10:34:48 GMT
From: pipex!uknet!edcastle!spider!raft.spider.co.uk!jmorris@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Brilliant postings
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul12.125639.22871@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>
>Manual Morse is now very much a specialty mode. During the debate
>leading up to the No Code license, I posed the question to a meeting
>of a local general interest ham club. I asked everyone who had made
>an amateur contact in the last 24 hours to stand. About 100 people
>stood, nearly everyone present. I then asked that only those who'd
>made an HF contact remain standing. The number dropped to about
>30. Then I asked that only those who had used Morse for the contact
>remain standing. There were 3 people left standing. That meets my
>definition of "few". Note that all these people were coded licensees.
>Things may be even more lopsided today, or not. I'm sure I'd have
>gotten different proportions if I'd asked the question at the
>Southeastern DXers meeting, or at a packet LAN meeting. My admittedly
>unscientific band survey of 20 meters a couple of months ago showed
>12% of the signals present were using Morse encoding.

Is this a valid survey? If I had been in the audience I would probably have been in the 97% not left standing - but my HF operation is 99% CW. I have only so much time for radio. I am on for a quick chat with the locals on 144 most evenings, but my HF operations is usually at weekends only. How about repeating the survey but using "last month" instead of "last 24h"?

73, John.

--
John Morris != Spider Systems jmorris@spider.co.uk GM4ANB@GB7EDN.#77.GBR.EU

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1993 15:59:47 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!wjturner@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Comments on CW issue.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hello, everyone in net-land.

I don't want this to turn into another edition in the on going flame-war, but I felt I had to add my comments to the discussion on CW. I will try to make them short.

First of all, I do not believe in the high-speed morse code tests, and I am a firm supporter of the no-code Technician. (I was one.) However, I do feel that some morse code should be required for some licenses. Thats just my opinion.

Several people have commented on CW dieing. That may be the case, but I don't see it that way. I see the CW portions of the bands (by that I mean the non-phone portions since CW is legal everywhere) as being very active. Sure there are people that can't send well, and so-called "scumbags", but there always have been. As for CW needing to be protected, I really doubt it. When I have worked SSB (rarely, though) I have noticed some CW being sent in the same area of the band, and it can become **very** annoying. On the other hand, when I have worked CW on the 40m band, and the Canadians or whoever are using SSB on the same frequency, I find it much less of a problem for me. I would venture to guess that if phone was allowed on all of the bands (thus "un-protecting" CW) that it would actually be the users of phone that would be hurt the most, and that the CWers would just keep on pounding away.

This is just my opinion, and you can take it or leave it.

73 es cul, Will

--
Will Turner, N0RDV
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

Date: 13 Jul 93 11:13:44 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:
[quote of a quote of a quote deleted]

>What the hell are you talking about? The only reason we have the HF
>bands is because nobody really wants them. Lets face it, with
>satellites, it's become obsolete for government and industry. The
>No-Code license has nothing to do with the saving of the HF bands. It
>didn't need to be saved.

Really? This will come as a shock to our WARC representatives, who
have had to fend off broadcast, fixed and maritime services (and
government users) desirous of the amateur HF bands. Tune across the
HF range some time. It's chock-a-block full of signals, and there
are considerably more *non*amateur signals than amateur signals.
No one wants HF? Ridiculous.

>Granted, it might have saved some of the VHF/UHF bands but think about
>that. Even with the influx of amateurs we still lost part of 220MHz,
>have been forced to share 70cm with Wind Profiler radars, and now we get
>to share the 33cm band with cordless phones and all sorts of other
>goodies. How much worse could it get?

The problem with 220-222 MHz was *never* lack of occupancy. This was
apparent at the time to anyone who wasn't predisposed to proving
otherwise by using invalid methods (e.g., the Repeater Directory) of
determining band occupancy. The presence of large numbers of codeless
Techs would not, I suspect, have made one whit of difference in the FCC's
rush to try to promote narrowband technology by turning that band over to
land mobile.

As for 70 cm, it's worth noting that we have *always* shared that band
with radars. (Well, not back during the days of "200 meters and down,"
of course.) The addition of wind-profiler radars does have potential
to interfere with amateur operations, but the NOAA folks are anxious
to cooperate with amateurs (thank you, SKYWARN) in siting radars and
dealing with interference problems. Speaking for myself, I like that
warm feeling I get from knowing that the pilot of the plane I'm in
has up-to-date weather information. If that means I have to work with
the folks at the weather service to fix EMC problems, I can live with
that.

As for 33 cm, I would remind you that since we got access to that band
in 1985, it has always been a "garbage band." We've *been* sharing it.
Our present concern with that band has mostly to do with the FCC's
proposal to expand the AVM/LMS service there. (Wind profilers may go
there as well as at 70 cm, too.) ARRL has suggested that more study of
possible interference be conducted before opening up that band to these
additional users.

By none of this do I mean to imply that we should sit quietly by and
allow other services to do whatever they please. But we *do* have to

recognize the fact that the use of radio communications is continually growing, while the available spectrum is not. That means more crowding for everyone, and the Amateur Service is not the only one affected. I'm wondering if you feel the same outrage at the "spectrum grab" we amateurs are doing at 219-220 MHz, where we want to be added as a sharing partner? Or is it only despicable when others do it?

>We have written Washington, only to have the ARRL overstep us and assert
>their views of the way things should be. You must be really naive about
>the way our government works. :)

You must be really naive if you think the FCC dances to the ARRL's tune. The FCC does give weight to ARRL's input. And it should, since ARRL represents 160k+ licensed amateurs. But I could cite numerous recent rulings where the FCC did things differently--sometimes radically so--from the way ARRL wanted them. I wish the FCC *did* listen more to the ARRL.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Date: 13 Jul 93 09:30:33 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk (Really, the semiannual CW war)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>Gack. Do we really need to go over this issue every three months?

Well, we don't, but from the usenet readership report I notice that there are several thousand new r.r.a. readers every three months or so. I suspect that they want to have as much fun arguing about CW/no-CW, etc., as we did.

Just because us "old-timer" net folks have already talked about it doesn't mean that it is old hat to everyone. If we want new r.r.a. participants, we have to allow them the freedom to explore those things that are new to *them*.

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

Ed Hare, KA1CV | ehare@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League

225 Main St.

Newington, CT 06111

(203) 666-1541 - voice

ARRL Laboratory Supervisor

RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing

"The goal of every engineer is to
retire without getting blamed for a
major catastrophe." -- Scott Adams
and Dilbert

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 93 15:18:47 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!fcom.cc.utah.edu!dave@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

nuts2u::little (little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com) wrote:

..

: petition down, what would be the reason?") but I thought the
: "Communications and Petitions" section of the meeting would have afforded
: me the opportunity to ask. Guess not.

: Makes you kind of wonder what "Land of the free" really means? Must be
: everything is free and provided by the government, because our rights are
: certainly being trod upon in a big way. Can't wait until they enact
: legislation telling me I can't park my car in my own drive way. RV's and
: boats are already prohibited, cars should be next.

: On a related matter, before the board were some ordinances to involuntarily
: annex a number of properties into the village. Neat trick, you surround
: the property on three sides and find a natural barrier on the fourth side
: and you can annex them without their consent.

This isn't really feasible probably, but you could try getting some other
community to annex the village into it involuntarily.

I suggest you slap a large "No. 6, private" sign on your house. Alas,
probably no one there would get it.

--

dave@csulx.weber.edu (sig by ByteWatchers & TransmitFast)

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 93 13:35:14 GMT

From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!lkollar@uunet.uu.net

Subject: machine-generated cw

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

zardoz@ornews.intel.com (Jim Garver) writes:

>> CW sending is still an art, and none the worse for that.

>Without any kind of recognizable character such as swing, syncopation, or
>other recognizable fist it seems like pretty sterile art to me. ...
>Hams who use iambic
>paddles and such might as well be using a computer. I can't tell the
>difference.

I can't get over 13-15 wpm with a straight key. And YOW did my wrist hurt
after that 2-hour CW ragchew on 15 meters! You might say I switched to
electronic keying in self-defense; I *do* love to ragchew. :-)

Sending even with an elec. keyer may well still be an art. I've heard some
awful machine-generated stuff, especially on 20m. You need to keep those
fancy ones adjusted! Receiving CW is certainly still an art...

Hmmm. I suppose it would be possible to make a computer-based keyer that
simulated swing. Seems I remember seeing a keyer that used a straight key
on the input to record the sender's fist.

>WA7LDV who still uses a J-38 (J-36 on Sundays)

73 de KC4WZK who uses a set of Nye Viking paddles with a Ramsey CW-7.

--

Larry Kollar, KC4WZK | 'finger lkollar' for ham-related interests.
lkollar@nyx.cs.du.edu | "Didn't vote for the lottery - won't play it."
"[The media] tore down Bush, now they're trying to tear down Clinton.
Are they trying to destroy the presidency?" - Barry Goldwater

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1993 19:02:53 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!srngenprp!
alanb@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: machine-generated cw
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jim Garver (zardoz@ornews.intel.com) wrote:
: In article <21slr6INNo60@emx.cc.utexas.edu> oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills)
writes:
: ... Hams who use iambic
: paddles and such might as well be using a computer. I can't tell the
: difference.

I sure can. Besides the obvious sending errors, hand-sent code just
doesn't have the perfectly-regular character/word spacing of machine-

sent code. Machine code may sound nice and clean, but it does get monotonous after awhile.

AL N1AL

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1993 02:00:25 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

brian@amdcl2.amd.com (Brian McMinn N5PSS) writes:

> To Code or Not To Code, *THAT* is the question! I've collected and
> distilled the *ENTIRE* net.wisdom on this issue and so I present the
> following canonical list for your elucidation. In order to conserve
> net.bandwidth, please search for your favorite answer and then respond
> by number rather than with the entire text. :-)

>
> Brian McMinn N5PSS brian.mcminn.amd.com

> 27) The ARRL did this to us! Blame *THEM*!
> 28) The ARRL tried their best to stop this! Blame *THEM*!
> 29) I'm going to cancel my ARRL membership over this *ONE* issue!

The above three illustrate the ARRL's waffling on the no-code issue.
Look it up, it's all there in black and white. First they opposed the
no-code, now they embrace it with open arms. Hmmm....

> 30) Hams who started with No-Code now represent 98% of all hams!

Could be, but lots of them upgraded because we didn't like our N#XXX
calls. :)

Tony

o o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
 \ / system @ garlic.sbs.com
 //
 (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
 /| _/_/
 / | {MTV}|| MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
* ||{____}||
 ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
 ^^ ^^

Date: 13 Jul 1993 10:15:08 -0700

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!ornews.intel.com!
ornews.intel.com!not-for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <21slr6INNo60@emx.cc.utexas.edu>, <21sshv\$76s@ornews.intel.com>,
<CA31LE.Hw9@odin.corp.sgi.com>a
Subject : Re: machine-generated cw

In article <CA31LE.Hw9@odin.corp.sgi.com> adams@chuck.dallas.sgi.com (Charles Adams) writes:

>
>at speeds in excess of 40 or 45 wpm, i don't see how anyone can
>do it with:
> d. any other mechanical to electronic conversion system other than
> a keyboard.

Well PSE QRS or else use RTTY, AMTOR, or packet.

>at one time i refused to use anything other than a Bug...

>
>sad to say i now have to use the Heath Ultrapro keyboard...

>
This is Sacrilege, of course. The degeneration of the heretic is
apparent.

>i know that there are people who like to play games with other people.
>they use the J38s, keyers with strange weighting, etc. to keep the
>individuals who do use computers for receiving confused and away from
>them. OK, but if your fist is so bad that it's an effort for me to copy,
>i'll go away. no big deal.

>
I usually use the J-38 to start with, sending clean code at 20-22 wpm.
As the QSO progresses I'll switch to the ol' Lionel J-36 with all the
parts removed and put on the other side for my left hand. The contact
will then find some reason to cut the QSO short such as dinner is ready
or something. Obviously a computer has been used for receiving. We
know the precise ratio of dit/dah length to set the bug to for computer
filtering.

>i'll tell you what. come SKN (straight key night), i'll take the
>J-38 mounted on a stained and polished board out and get on.

I wish SKN wasn't on New Year's eve. I'm busy out listening to people
trying to blow up the world. But I'll fire up the DX-100 and give the

J-38 a workout anytime.

--

WA7LDV zardo@ornews.intel.com

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1993 16:09:33 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!hubcap!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <21pgi2INNaua@emx.cc.utexas.edu>, <1993Jul12.125639.22871@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993Jul13.103448.27758@spider.co.uk>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Brilliant postings

In article <1993Jul13.103448.27758@spider.co.uk> jmorris@spider.co.uk (John Morris) writes:

>

>Is this a valid survey? If I had been in the audience I would probably have
>been in the 97% not left standing - but my HF operation is 99% CW. I have
>only so much time for radio. I am on for a quick chat with the locals on
>144 most evenings, but my HF operations is usually at weekends only. How
>about repeating the survey but using "last month" instead of "last 24h"?

I wasn't trying to determine if they *ever* used CW just their typical usage. Since at that time all were coded licensees, it is expected that they knew how to use CW, and according to since deleted requirements, were required to maintain competence for license renewal purposes by doing *some* CW operating. I did ask how many could still operate CW at their license level. Some were honest, only about 2/3rds stood. I should have asked in Morse. :-)

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1993 16:37:52 GMT

From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!hubcap!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <21pgi2INNaua@emx.cc.utexas.edu>, <1993Jul12.125639.22871@ke4zv.uucp>,
<930712.152321.1u0.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Brilliant postings

In article <930712.152321.1u0.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com
(Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>

>Problem with your little informal survey is the fact that the club is
>comprised mostly of members who use 2m and 70cm regularly. Of course
>they're not going to make as many CW contacts. Try doing a survey with
>valid data next time.

Oh, it's a fact huh Tony? I suppose you know the operating habits of
the members of the club. This is a general interest club, not an
autopatch club. Even DXers are allowed to join, though they are
asked to sit in the back. :-) We even sometimes let DXers put on
the program, though it's more likely someone doing ATV, packet,
satellite, or bunny hunting who will be the speaker. This *is*
a cross section of amateur radio. If I'd asked only CW operators
if they operated CW that would really be a valid sample now
wouldn't it?

It is true that most hams probably operate more VHF and UHF than
HF today, but that just shows the relative importance that they
give to the different modes of operation. For years my only mobile
rig was a Galaxy V MkII. I lived on HF, but not anymore. Today I
only fire up the 735 if the repeaters are quiet. That's probably
typical. At home, I'm most likely to be found in front of the
736R working satellites, or occasionally firing up the B&W 6100
for a bit of HF RTTY. That's less typical I think. Most home
HF stations seem to be devoted to DXing or ragchewing via voice.
Still, it's more likely that the ham at home will be using a
HT rather than a key.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1993 01:55:48 EST

From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul11.212512.24067@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <!gtxl7@dixie.com>,
<21rshmINN5d@topaz.bds.com>
Subject : Re: Brilliant postings

ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

> When I tune across the dial I hear maybe a couple hundred machine-generated
> CW conversations going on.
>
> OK, John, how do you determine whether the CW is machine generated? A good
> iambic keyer in competent hands will sound identical to the ideal weighting.
>
> -Ron

Exactly! I've watched a friend of mine (NM1Z) go at it with an iambic
keyer at close to 35WPM with perfect weighting. Whew.. can't wait until
the day I can do that... right now my code speed is probably around
20-22WPM.

Tony

```
-----  
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE  
      \      / system @ garlic.sbs.com  
      (oo)  
 /|  \  /      Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.  
/ |  {MTV} ||  
* || {__} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's  
  ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)  
  ^^      ^^  
-----
```

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1993 01:57:54 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <24.794.2805.0NB2962E@pcohio.com>,
<1993Jul11.054430.6530@newsgate.sps.mot.com>, <CA29oH.Ks@squam.banyan.com>
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

dts@banyan.com (Daniel Senie) writes:

> The short answer is that the code tests are a government approved form of Haz

> ing.
> This from a government that outlawed hazing...

Ok, just one more time. This is your brain, and this is your brain on drugs. Seriously, it isn't the government that sets the rule about morse code proficiency, it's an ITU requirement. The problem is that the ITU didn't bother to specify a speed and now it's causing all sorts of problems with the whiners who think that morse code is cruel and unusual punishment. Awwwwwww... poor baby.

Tony

```
-----
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
        \    / system @ garlic.sbs.com
         \__/_/
          (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
    /|  ___  \ /
  / | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
* || {___} ||
  ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
  ^^        ^^
-----
```

Date: Tue, 13 Jul 93 06:57:48 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!hubcap!
emory!rsiatl!jgd@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul11.212512.24067@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <!gtxl7@dixie.com>,
<21rshmINN5d@topaz.bds.com>
Subject : Re: Brilliant postings

ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

> When I tune across the dial I hear maybe a couple hundred machine-generated
> CW conversations going on.

>OK, John, how do you determine whether the CW is machine generated? A good
>iambic keyer in competent hands will sound identical to the ideal weighting.

By what's being said, of course. No, I can't copy CW at any speed but my TNC can. If the sender is speaking in 2 letter word abbreviations, it is most likely hand-sent. Whole sentences without many Q codes or abbreviations are likely machine sent. Even without copying, one can listen to how long a transmission lasts before turning it over and get a pretty good idea. Keyboard QS0s tend to be long winded by hand-sent

code standards and are almost never full breakin.

John

--

John De Armond, WD40QC		(Pardon the inconvenience while we
Performance Engineering Magazine(TM)		remodel this .signature)
Marietta, Ga		
jgd@dixie.com		

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #226
